



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,914	04/25/2001	Isao Takahashi	109357	5217
25944	7590	01/26/2006	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			HANNETT, JAMES M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2612	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/840,914	Applicant(s) TAKAHASHI, ISAO	
	Examiner James M. Hannett	Art Unit 2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-10 and 13-37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11, 12 and 38-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/3/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues the prior art does not teach the method of displaying an image on a display of a computer based on image data transferred from a camera to a computers hard drive. The examiner strongly disagrees with the applicant and points out that Camara et al teaches on Column 2, Lines 52-67, Column 6, Lines 16-45 and depicts in Figures (1 and 6) displaying an image (opening an image with a application) at a display device (48) based upon the image data thus recorded in the recording device (44), by the computer (22) apparatus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

and 38-40

1: Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,373,507 Camara et al in view of USPN 6,374,266 Shnelvar.

2: As for Claim 11, Camara et al teaches on Column 20, Lines 15-50 a system in which images stored in a camera memory can be transferred to the memory (44) of a computer (22) system. Camara et al teaches that the camera download manager which resides in the computer system will maintain a database of all the images previously downloaded from a given camera and will not download the images that are already cached. Camara et al teaches that this method prevents any image from being downloaded more than once. Camara et al further teaches on

Art Unit: 2612

Column 2, Lines 52-67 Column 6, Lines 16-45 and depicts in Figures (1 and 6) displaying an image (opening an image with a application) at a display device (48) based upon the image data thus recorded in the recording device (44), by the computer (22) apparatus. However, Camara et al does not give specifics as to what information is used to determine if the images are already stored in the computer memory.

Shnelvar teaches on Column 3, Lines 36-52 and on Column 6, Lines 8-35 a method of transferring data files from one system to another system which prevents files from being downloaded multiple times. Shnelvar teaches that each time a file is copied from a data source, a data table is searched which contains information about all the data files stored in memory. Shnelvar teaches the use of a table that contains hash values on all of the data files stored in the memory of the computer. The Hash values are viewed by the examiner as attribute information. Therefore, Shnelvar teaches preparing attribute (hash values) information of the data in the data source. Shnelvar teaches that the hash values of the incoming data are compared to hash values in a table stored in the memory of the computer. Shnelvar teaches that when the two sets of data match, the data is not stored in the computers memory. Furthermore, Shnelvar teaches that when the two sets of data do not match, the data is saved to memory, and the hash data of the incoming image is added to the table of hash values stored in the computer. Shnelvar teaches that this method is advantageous because it increases the speed in which incoming data can be compared to data in a data base to determine if the file has already been downloaded, therefore, increasing processing time.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method for storing and transferring data files of Shnelvar as the

Art Unit: 2612

method for determining if the image files have already been transferred in Camara et al in order to increase the speed in which the incoming image files can be compared to the images already downloaded and therefore increasing processing time.

3: In regards to Claim 12, Claim 12 is rejected for reasons discussed related to Claim 11, since Claim 11 is substantively equivalent to Claim 12.

4: As for Claim 38, Camara et al teaches on Column 20, Lines 15-50, Column 2, Lines 52-67 Column 6, Lines 16-45 and depicts in Figures (1 and 6) an image data transmitting system, comprising: an electronic camera (28); and an image data receiving device (22), wherein: the electronic camera (28) comprises an image capturing unit that captures an image of a subject to generate image data, and a camera control unit that prepares attribute information of the image data and records the image data and the attribute information of the image data into a recording medium (memory of camera); and the image data receiving device (22) comprises a receiving unit (USB interface 50) that connects with the electronic camera (28) and receives the image data and the attribute information of the image data recorded in the recording medium (memory of camera) from the electronic camera (28), a recording unit (44) that stores the image data and the attribute information of the image data received from the electronic camera (28), a display unit (48), and a control unit (40) that controls the receiving unit (USB interface 50), the recording unit (memory 44) and display unit (48); However, Camara et al does not give specifics as to what information is used to determine if the images are already stored in the computer memory.

Shnelvar teaches on Column 3, Lines 36-52 and on Column 6, Lines 8-35 a method of transferring data files from one system to another system which prevents files from being downloaded multiple times. Shnelvar teaches that each time a file is copied from a data source, a

Art Unit: 2612

data table is searched which contains information about all the data files stored in memory.

Shnelvar teaches the use of a table that contains hash values on all of the data files stored in the memory of the computer. The Hash values are viewed by the examiner as attribute information.

Therefore, Shnelvar teaches preparing attribute (hash values) information of the data in the data source (camera memory). Shnelvar teaches that the hash values of the incoming data are

compared to hash values in a table stored in the memory of the computer. Shnelvar teaches that when the two sets of data match, the data is not stored in the computers memory. Furthermore,

Shnelvar teaches that when the two sets of data do not match, the data is saved to memory, and the hash data of the incoming image is added to the table of hash values stored in the computer.

Shnelvar teaches that this method is advantageous because it increases the speed in which incoming data can be compared to data in a data base to determine if the file has already been downloaded, therefore, increasing processing time.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method for storing and transferring data files of Shnelvar as the method for determining if the image files have already been transferred in Camara et al in order to increases the speed in which the incoming image files can be compared to the images already downloaded and therefore increasing processing time.

5: In regards to Claim 39, Camara et al teaches on Column 20, Lines 15-50, Column 2, Lines 52-67 Column 6, Lines 16-45 and depicts in Figures (1 and 6) an image data transmitting system, comprising: an electronic camera (28); and an image data receiving device (22), wherein: the electronic camera (28) comprises an image capturing unit that captures an image of a subject to generate image data, and a camera control unit that prepares attribute information of

Art Unit: 2612

the image data and records the image data and the attribute information of the image data into a recording medium (memory of camera); and the image data receiving device (22) comprises a receiving unit (USB interface 50) that connects with the electronic camera (28) and receives the image data and the attribute information of the image data recorded in the recording medium (memory of camera) from the electronic camera (28), a recording unit (44) that stores the image data and the attribute information of the image data received from the electronic camera (28), a display unit (48), and a control unit (40) that controls the receiving unit (USB interface 50), the recording unit (memory 44) and display unit (48); However, Camara et al does not give specifics as to what information is used to determine if the images are already stored in the computer memory.

Shnelvar teaches on Column 3, Lines 36-52 and on Column 6, Lines 8-35 a method of transferring data files from one system to another system which prevents files from being downloaded multiple times. Shnelvar teaches that each time a file is copied from a data source, a data table is searched which contains information about all the data files stored in memory. Shnelvar teaches the use of a table that contains hash values on all of the data files stored in the memory of the computer. The Hash values are viewed by the examiner as attribute information. Therefore, Shnelvar teaches preparing attribute (hash values) information of the data in the data source (camera memory). Shnelvar teaches that the hash values of the incoming data are compared to hash values in a table stored in the memory of the computer. Shnelvar teaches that when the two sets of data match, the data is not stored in the computers memory. Furthermore, Shnelvar teaches that when the two sets of data do not match, the data is saved to memory, and the hash data of the incoming image is added to the table of hash values stored in the computer.

Art Unit: 2612

Shnelvar teaches that this method is advantageous because it increases the speed in which incoming data can be compared to data in a data base to determine if the file has already been downloaded, therefore, increasing processing time.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method for storing and transferring data files of Shnelvar as the method for determining if the image files have already been transferred in Camara et al in order to increase the speed in which the incoming image files can be compared to the images already downloaded and therefore increasing processing time.

6: As for Claim 40, Camara et al further teaches on Column 2, Lines 52-67 Column 6, Lines 16-45 and depicts in Figures (1 and 6) displaying an image (opening an image with a application) at a display device (48) based upon the image data thus recorded in the recording device (44), by the computer (22) apparatus. Therefore, the newly received and recorded image data (images transferred from camera), by the computer (22) apparatus, wherein the computer apparatus (22) displays the image on the display device (48) based upon the detected image data (images allowed to be saved to computer).

7: Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,373,507 Camara et al in view of USPN 6,374,266 Shnelvar in further view of USPN 6,058,428 Wang et al.

8: In regards to Claim 41, Camara et al teaches on Column 2, Lines 52-67 Column 6, Lines 16-45 and depicts in Figures (1 and 6) displaying an image (opening an image with a application) at a display device (48) based upon the image data thus recorded in the recording device (44), by the computer (22) apparatus. Camara et al also teaches the ability to delete the images after they

Art Unit: 2612

are viewed on the display (Column 6, Lines 15-65). Camara et al teaches using an operating system which allows users to view images stored in the hard drive of a computer. Furthermore, Camara et al teaches that a user can delete the images after they view them if they desire. However, Camara et al in view of Shnelvar does not teach the newly received and recorded image data is detected in the computer apparatus by: creating an identification data file containing information related to the newly received and recorded image data; recording the identification data file in a specific recording area; reading the identification data file from the specific recording area; identifying the newly received and recorded image data by using the identification data file read from the specific recording area; and deleting the identification data file recorded in the specific recording area after identifying.

Wang et al teaches the use of a method for transferring digital images on a network. Wang et al teaches on Column 4, Lines 15-40 that it is advantageous when designing a computer system to store images to enable the computer system to generate thumbnail images of the full resolution images, and store the link to the thumbnail image in a database. The examiner views the newly received and recorded image data as the downloaded images from the camera. The examiner views “creating an identification data file containing information related to the newly received and recorded image data” as creating a thumbnail image which is stored in the database. Furthermore, the examiner views recording the identification data file (thumbnail image) in a specific recording area (database); reading the identification data file (thumbnail image) from the specific recording area (database); identifying the newly received and recorded image data by using the identification data file (thumbnail image) read from the specific recording area (database).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow a user of the computer system of Camara et al to use the thumbnail indexing database system of Wang et al to view the transmitted images in order to allow the computer user to better manage the downloaded files.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James M. Hannett whose telephone number is 571-272-7309. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:00 pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ngoc Yen Vu can be reached on 571-272-7320. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Art Unit: 2612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James M. Hannett
Examiner
Art Unit 2612



JMH
January 17, 2006



NGOC-YEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER